

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF TENNESSEE  
NASHVILLE DIVISION

EDNA BRIGHT,	)	
	)	
Plaintiff,	)	
	)	NO. 3:18-cv-00756
v.	)	JUDGE RICHARDSON
	)	
REBECCA N. BARTLETT,	)	
	)	
Defendant.	)	

**ORDER**

Pending before the Court is a Report and Recommendation (Doc. No. 26), in which the Magistrate Judge recommends that Defendant's Motion for Transfer of Venue (Doc. No. 16) be granted. No Objections to this Report and Recommendation have been filed. In fact, Plaintiff has filed a document indicating that she "has no objections to the transfer of venue to the Eastern District Court of Tennessee" (Doc. No. 26).

The failure to object to a report and recommendation releases the Court from its duty to independently review the matter. *Frias v. Frias*, No. 2:18-cv-00076, 2019 WL 549506, at \* 2 (M.D. Tenn. Feb. 12, 2019); *Hart v. Bee Property Mgmt.*, Case No. 18-cv-11851, 2019 WL 1242372, at \* 1 (E.D. Mich. March 18, 2019) (citing *Thomas v. Arn*, 474 U.S. 140, 149 (1985)). The district court is not required to review, under a *de novo* or any other standard, those aspects of the report and recommendation to which no objection is made. *Ashraf v. Adventist Health System/Sunbelt, Inc.*, 322 F. Supp. 3d 879, 881 (W.D. Tenn. 2018); *Benson v. Walden Security*, Case No. 3:18-cv-0010, 2018 WL 6322332, at \* 3 (M.D. Tenn. Dec. 4, 2018). The district court should adopt the magistrate judge's findings and rulings to which no specific objection is filed. *Id.*

Accordingly, the Report and Recommendation of the Magistrate Judge (Doc. No. 25) is **ADOPTED and APPROVED**. The Motion for Transfer of Venue (Doc. No. 16) is **GRANTED**, and the Clerk is directed to transfer this case to the Eastern District of Tennessee, pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 1406(a).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

  
ELI RICHARDSON  
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE